REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Brumbelow et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,119,104 ("Brumbelow"). In response, Applicant has

amended claims 1, 15, 26, 30-31 and 33.

Applicants thank the Examiner for her time in conducting a telephone interview on July

26, 2005. Applicant believes that the time was spent effectively and significant progress was

made. During the telephone interview, Applicant's attorney, Applicant's agent and the Examiner

discussed claims 1, 15 and 26 and the cited reference and corresponding rejections outstanding in

the Examiner's office action. Examiner suggested that Applicant amend claims 1, 15 and 26 to

recite additional detail regarding the key. Examiner further suggested that Applicant amend claim

15 to avoid potential issues relating to 35 U.S.C. § 101. In response, Applicant has amended

claims 1, 15, 26 and 33. Claims 30 and 31 have been amended in form.

Independent claims 1, 15 and 26 as amended recite an application environment, computer

program product and method (respectively) for providing an integrated application environment.

Each of these claims includes an element comprising a centralized store of information, or,

equivalently, a desktop bus, that provides a stored key to an application responsive to a pre-

specified event. The application uses the key to index, and thereby retrieve, data. Support for the

amendments to claims 1, 15 and 26 can be found in the specification at paragraphs [0034] and

[0037].

For example, claim 15 as amended recites:

9

15.   A computer program product comprising a computer-usable medium having computer-readable code embodied therein for providing an integrated application environment, the computer-readable code comprising:

a desktop bus module for receiving a key that indexes data about a customer, the data accessible from a remote computer system, storing the key, and providing the key to an application program responsive to an occurrence of a pre-specified event; and

a bus interface module for enabling communications between the application program and the desktop bus module, the bus interface module adapted to provide the key to the desktop bus module and receive the key from the desktop bus module.

Thus, provision is made in claims 1, 15 and 26 for a key that indexes information about a particular customer (e.g., the customer's name or account) to an application program upon the occurrence of some pre-specified event, such as the bus receiving a key from another application or the application gaining focus. This claim element allows multiple applications executing on a single client computer to be synchronized, so that each application displays information about the same customer. This feature allows a user working on the client computer to view information about the same customer across all (or a subset) of the applications executing on the client. The user thus does not need to worry that certain of the applications are displaying "stale" information, e.g., information about a different customer identified by a different key.

Examiner refers to column 3, lines 1-9 of Brumbelow, which discuss various "functional desktops" using the "customer object," so that "each desktop has all the customer information available..." The objects access an object database that allows the objects to "compile and share information apart from the mainframe database and application programs." This teaching differs from providing a key to an application program upon the occurrence of a pre-specified event. In the absence of this capability, the Brumbelow system cannot, for example, enable applications to

update displayed information in response to a user-initiated change of customer in another application.

Furthermore, Brumbelow appears to teach away from updating applications and displayed information. For example, column 9, lines 23-26 state that "The products object 94 will always assume that the data within the CBD database 106 is up-to-date and accurate. Thus, the products object 94 will not necessarily directly request refreshes of the CBD database." As stated in column 5 lines 47-49, the products object 94 "facilitates access to the PIR database 32 in the mainframe 18 and returns product rates and fee information upon request." Thus, the Brumbelow system does not require updating product rates and fee information—seemingly important parameters—as supplied by products object 94 (and thus as displayed by the user desktops). Accordingly, a person of ordinary skill in the art reading Brumbelow would not be inclined to implement a method for updating information based on a key that indexes stored data, wherein the key is stored and provided to an application program responsive to an occurrence of a pre-specified event.

Thus, Brumbelow neither teaches nor suggests the claimed features. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art, considering the teachings of Brumbelow, would not find the claimed invention obvious.

Dependent claims 7, 9, 21, 22, 30, and 32 recite further details of the pre-specified event and Applicant respectfully submits that the features of these claims are not found in Brumbelow. Further, claims 13 and 23 recite using color to indicate which of a plurality of sessions identified by a customer key is active. The portion of Brumbelow relied upon by the Examiner to recite these claims (col. 7, lines 13-33) does not discuss using color as claimed and Applicant submits that the claimed features would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill. Applicant submits

11

that the dependent claims not specifically mentioned above are patentable at least due to the features of their respective base claims.

In summary, based on the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-4 and 6-33 are patentably distinguishable over Brumbelow and requests that this application be passed to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the stated grounds of objection and rejection set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action have been properly accommodated or addressed. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and withdraw them. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if it is felt that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted
Dennis J. Nasrawi

Date: SEPT. 26, 2005

By: _____

David K. Varn
Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 53,718
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94306
(650) 335-7183
dvarn@fenwick.com

12